



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the people in bondage. In so doing he more sharply defined the contours of each class and imposed upon each "a heavier and more complicated burden of obligations." During the period of reaction that followed, the nobility was relieved of the obligation of compulsory service, while they retained bondage right. The bonded man or woman was, as it were, leased to the nobleman for the payment of a poll-tax, with the result that the rights of the peasant and the obligation of the landowner to both peasant and State practically ceased to be.

The facts of earlier Russian history as discussed by Professor Mavor form in themselves an explanation of the development of the nation into its more modern form, and furnish a background for the understanding of later tendencies and problems. Particularly in his second volume, the author, with political as well as economic insight and with no little power of psychological interpretation, describes the fall of bondage, the conditions which resulted from emancipation, the trend of political thought as expressed in revolutionary and social-Democratic movements, the position of the *Intelligentsia*—all the phases, in fact, of modern Russian life, so curiously determined and colored by the past. The student of economics and of world history will find in Professor Mavor's study of the important but little-understood history of Russia what has long been needed—a comprehensive and authoritative work upon this subject. The author makes use of the profound researches of modern Russian scholars, and in doing so he manifests unmistakable scholarship and critical ability.

ROMAN IMPERIALISM. By TENNEY FRANK. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914.

The view of Roman imperialism most commonly upheld, or rather taken for granted, is no doubt more open to criticism on the ground of superficiality than those who are absorbed in the details and particular problems of Roman history are prone to realize. Our ideas of the process by which Rome's empire was built up are almost inevitably colored by our knowledge of later European history and of modern European conditions. We instinctively take as fundamental axioms such motives as land-hunger, commercial rivalry, or that ambition for empire-building which is in part an inheritance from the Roman Empire itself. Upon the Romans, however, economic conditions did not bear hard; commerce for a long period was among them a factor of little importance; no awe-inspiring tradition of empire had come down to them from the past, nor were they interested in the propagation of a religion laying claim to world-wide recognition. Then, too, there has been the parallel tendency to identify the methods and ideals of republican Rome with those of Asiatic monarchies, which differed widely from the Roman State in that they were artificial groupings of many diverse peoples held together by the force of mercenary armies, and dependent upon conquest and tribute for their very existence. The more one considers the case in outline, the more evident becomes the need of a revision of *a priori* views and of a fresh examination of the facts. The early Romans were, for the most part, conservative farmers, living under a republican form of government; the *mos maiorum* did not recognize the right of aggression or the desire for more territory as just occasions for war. Moreover, to the Roman State, constituted as it was, victories meant fresh problems of administration rather than increase of

wealth. The ideal of the early State would seem to have been, not aggrandisement through conquest, but peace with justice; and considering the complexity of inter-State relations in ancient times, we ought not to be surprised at the number of wars Rome waged, but rather at her success in maintaining peaceful relations with her neighbors. Moreover, in the conventional view lurks something of the fallacy inherent in the older system of political economy—the assumption that men in the long run always act in conformity to a more or less intelligent conception of their material interests.

Professor Frank's approach to the subject—his willingness to reckon in all sorts of causes without prejudice, aiming rather at a versatile interpretation of facts than at the establishment of a single dominant tendency—is eminently persuasive. His retelling of Roman history from its dawn to the founding of the world-empire possesses the intelligibility, the variety, and the occasional suggestion of fortuity, which a story of human evolution and achievement ought to have. As told by him, the tale of Rome's empire-building becomes at once "scientific" and humanly interesting, because it is, so to speak, "true to life." His interpretation is elastic enough to admit the elements of uncertainty and of personality—scientific enough to form a real nexus of cause and effect. What may, perhaps, be called "pseudo-causality"—the linking of events and periods by connections neither of cause and effect nor of resemblance or contrast, but by what is really little more than a sort of narrative tissue—this mode of implying more connection than really exists, which seems to the layman a vice of most historians, is rather notably absent from Professor Frank's work.

Roman expansion, the author finds to have been a "groping, stumbling, accidental" process, and he would have us, if we hope to understand it, "rid ourselves of anachronistic generalizations, and look instead for the specific accidents that led the nation unwittingly from one contest to another until, to her own surprise, Rome was mistress of the Mediterranean world." This general view is maintained by a careful analysis of economic facts and political motives—an analysis conducted with something of that *flair* which comes of a thorough and humanly interested reading of ancient political literature, and also with a quite adequate critical detachment. The policy of the Senate one sees was, throughout the whole history of republican Rome, singularly conservative, while the disposition to exploit conquered territory was from a modern point of view curiously weak. Again, the Second Punic War is viewed as by no means an irrepressible conflict between two nations that could brook no rivalry. "The cause of the war was neither desire for world conquest upon the part of either power, nor a dispute over predominant influence in Spain." International relations as now understood did not then exist; the term "sphere of influence" would have had no meaning for a Roman, and there were times, doubtless, when the Senate would have been glad to hear that the whole peninsula of Spain had been sunk beneath the sea. The nations, then, "came to blows because the Barcid family—whose war policy had met with defeat in 242 and 238 B. C., were able to keep alive the bitter feelings aroused by former defeats and to discover a situation at the right moment whereby they could force their government to support a raid of vengeance on Italy." After the close of the war the force of sentimental philhellenism swept the Romans farther afield in international politics, so that even at the cost of straining the sacred *ius fetiale* they joined the Hellenic concert of powers. And when

the wars with Philip and Antiochus were over, Rome neither adopted the Oriental theory of conquest, nor even, in accordance with her own ancient methods, extended her federation. On the contrary, her associates in the war remained simply *amici* as before, while her defeated enemies were added to the list of "friends." In great and little affairs the lack of anything like a modern imperialist policy is in general manifest throughout the narrative. Pompey, it appears, was the first genuine imperialist, and Cæsar was the first *candid* one. Such are some of the main contentions in a work that both rationalizes and enlivens with intellectual interest the period of which it treats.

MY LOVE AND I. By ALICE BROWN. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914.

To attempt a destructive analysis of Alice Brown's new story would be both unjust and futile, because the story has a quality of its own that makes it notably worth while. It is true that throughout its earlier chapters the tale, despite its evident earnestness and the perfect appropriateness of its literary dress, seems to partake in some degree of the weakness of conventional romance—the weakness of being written *up* and thought *down*—decorated, that is, to romantic taste, and simplified to romantic standards. We feel, at first, not as if we were going to be vitally interested, but rather as if our interest were being enmeshed and bound up in strands of silk and gold. But that doesn't really matter, because the story turns out to have life of an unusually intense sort.

Martin Redfield was a country boy with a desperate longing for the places where the strange roads go down. After his father's death he stayed on the old farm to care for his mother, and his craving for travel, for human nature, and for books had to go unsatisfied. But when his mother died he went to seek his fortune in the wide world. He endured much, we gather, yet remained singularly boyish. There seems to be no particular reason why he should have gone to Trinidad, but he did, and there he worked in a hotel stable until he was taken charge of by that paragon of English gentlemen, Egerton Sims, who made the boy his private secretary and pupil and friend, and would have made him his heir if he hadn't died prematurely of heart disease. Left friendless again, Martin went to Boston to study and look for literary work, and here he fell in with a semi-bohemian group of literary good-fellows. Most of these merely help, acceptably enough, to fill in the background. They are quaintly decorative—that is all—and when we meet them we do not feel that we are really crossing the boundary between the author's imaginary world and the real world. Perhaps we wouldn't even take much stock in Blake, the poet of the group, if it wasn't for the devoted Mary Owen. But Mary is splendid, and, after all, Blake is a real poet: as to his poetry, he is magnificently alive, and he doesn't merely rant or affect superfine standards. Yes—there is a peculiarly intense life in him; he deserves Mary's mothering because he is a genius. And the other important persons of the story, are—all of them—at the *critical stages*, more really alive than most of us in our rather humdrum, unmoral lives ever are. Martin asked Mary to marry him, because every one else in the group had done so, and also because he was really very fond of her; but of course she wouldn't have him because she was in love